



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Deuk-hwan CHANG

Application No.: 10/791,757

Group Art Unit: 3653

Filed: March 4, 2004

Examiner: Thomas A. Morrison

For: PAPER-FEEDING APPARATUS OF AN IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2005 having a shortened period for response set to expire on April 30, 2005, the following remarks are provided.

I. Listing of Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17, and 23 are generic, claim 18 reads on Species I (FIGS. 3 and 4), and claims 19-22 read on Species II (FIGS. 5-6B).

II. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.142

Applicant provisionally elects **Species I** (generic claims 1-17, and 23, and Species I claim 18) in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

III. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Species II is concerned, it is believed that claims 19-22 are so closely related to elected claims 1-18, and 23, that they should remain in the same application. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of claims 19-22, in addition to elected claims 1-18, and 23, would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i),

§808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

Even if the Examiner considers claims 19-22 to be a separate invention from claims 1-18, and 23, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider claims 1-23 (Species I-II) together.

IV. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.


If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 29 June 2005

By:   
Michael A. Bush  
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Ste. 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501